Spring 2010

Latin American immigrants in Indianapolis: Perceptions of prejudice and discrimination

Antonio V. Menéndez Alarcón
Butler University, amenende@butler.edu

Katherine B. Novak
Butler University, kbnovak@butler.edu

Latin American immigrants in Indianapolis: Perceptions of prejudice and discrimination

Antonio V. Menéndez Alarcón and Katherine B. Novak

Abstract

The article focuses on immigrants' interactions with the Indiana natives, with emphasis in the city of Indianapolis and its suburbs. More specifically, this study aims at providing an understanding of the experiences of Latin American immigrants with special attention to perceptions of prejudice and discrimination and to feelings of social exclusion. A substantial proportion of Latin American immigrants interviewed indicated that they considered Indiana natives to be prejudiced and that they had personally experienced discrimination. The study reveals specific examples of discrimination experienced by the immigrants at the work place, in housing, in stores, restaurants and by various service providers. The results of the study demonstrate the relevance of the normative and power resource theories to explain prejudice and discrimination.

Introduction

Background

International immigration to Indiana has become increasingly significant in the past 20 years. According to an estimate of the US Census Bureau (2000), Indiana's immigrant population grew by 55 per cent during the 1990s – the fourth largest increase in the nation among states with a foreign-born population of at least 50,000. Data from the 2004 American Community Survey (US Census Bureau, 2004) and other estimates (Clark and Heet, 2007) indicate that this pattern of growth has continued, particularly in Indianapolis, the state capital. According to these studies about 4 per cent of Indiana residents were born outside of the United States and 80,000 of these individuals entered the country between 1999 and 2004.

Consistent with what is occurring in the rest of the United States, the nature of the immigrant population is shifting. Whereas international immigrants in Indiana once originated largely from Europe and Canada, they are now making their way from Latin America, Asia and India. As in many areas of the Midwest, the greatest increase has been in immigrants from Latin America. Indeed, census figures indicate that the Hispanic population in the Indianapolis area has increased by 294 per cent from a total of 8450 in 1990 to 33,290 in 2000 (US Census Bureau, 2000). Several help agencies and the US Citizenship and Immigration Services (IDWD-IBRC, 2006) suggest that the figure provided by the census was underestimated. Recent studies suggest that the number of undocumented immigrants may even have been as high as 85,000 by 2005 (Passel, 2006). The Indiana Business Research Center, based on official data from the US Citizenship and Naturalization Service, places the total number of Latin American immigrants at

105,342 in 2004. If we add to this the Pew estimates for numbers of undocumented immigrants, the total number of Latin American immigrants in Indiana in 2005 was somewhere between 160,000 and 190,000. By 2008 that number must have risen to over 200,000. Forty-one per cent of these Latin American immigrants entered the state of Indiana between 2000 and 2005 (IDWD-IBRC, 2007).

Latin Americans of Mexican descent constitute the largest national group in Indianapolis – about 50 percent according to some estimates (Snodgrass, 2007) – followed by Puerto Ricans. A considerable proportion of the Hispanic population is categorized in the Census as ‘‘Other Hispanic,’’ which includes those from Central and South America.

The immigration of Latin Americans to Indiana is part of a recent trend that is also being observed in other areas of the Midwest, as recent research has revealed (for example, Benedict and Kent, 2004; Driever, 2004; Millard *et al*, 2004a). Latin American immigrants have been primarily concentrated in states such as Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, New Mexico, New Jersey, New York and Texas with a high percentage being located in large metropolitan areas such as New York, Chicago, Miami and Los Angeles (Suro and Singer, 2002). Today, the Latino population is increasingly found in locations outside these traditional areas. Research in these new areas of immigration (Katz, 1996; Carlin, 1999; Taylor and Stein, 1999; Frey, 2002; Johnson-Webb, 2002, 2003; Zuñiga and Hernández-Léon, 2005) has shown that the search for cheap labor in the meatpacking industry and other factories, in agriculture, and in the service industries in the Midwest, combined with the immigrants' search for better places to live have driven this new migration flow.

Traditionally, Latin American immigration to Indiana was concentrated in the northwest industrial poles, which are essentially suburbs of Chicago (including the cities of East Chicago, Hammond and Gary). Although these areas have had a considerable Latin American presence as far back as the beginning of the twentieth century, throughout most of the twentieth century the number of Latin American immigrants in these traditional destinations grew at a relatively lower rate. Immigrants are still coming to the Northwest; however, since the 1980s they have been increasingly moving to North Central Indiana (including Elkhart, South Bend, Fort Wayne, Goshen) and to Central Indiana, mostly to Lafayette and Indianapolis and its suburbs (Clark and Heet, 2007). It is these latter areas that, as previously noted, have seen the fastest growth rates.

Although there is a considerable body of research on the impact of international immigration on cities such as New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, San Francisco, Dallas and Boston, there is less research devoted to cities located in the Midwest (with the exception of Chicago) that have not traditionally attracted a large number of international immigrants. Although the studies on traditional immigrant destinations provide important empirical and theoretical insights, we cannot assume that individual processes of integration will be exactly the same everywhere. Indeed, the impact of 20,000 immigrants living in a city such as Indianapolis will not be the same as that in New York, Houston, or Chicago where immigrants have become a ‘‘familiar and expected presence’’ (Portes and Rumbaut, 2000). The growing literature on Latin American

immigrants residing in nontraditional locations supports this assessment. Singer's (2004) study and the studies included in the edited volumes of Zuñiga and Hernández-Léon (2005) and Millard *et al* (2004a) suggest that Latin Americans experiences in these new destinations are often different from those found in more traditional locations.

In addition to these findings, there are a number of important studies addressing this recent immigration flow to the Midwest that have informed our own research. For example, Gouveia *et al* (2005) analyze the impact of the Latin American immigrants' growth in Nebraska; Rich and Miranda (2005) show the ambivalent reactions (a mix of paternalism and xenophobia) toward Mexican immigrants in Lexington, Kentucky; Grey and Woodrick (2005) examine the relationships between immigrants and locals in a small Iowa town; and Broadway (1994) already in the 1990s analyzed the new trend of immigration to the Midwest and the impact of immigrants in a Kansas beef-packing town. Studies conducted in Indiana include the Indianapolis Hispanic demographic study (UWCI, 2000), the Aponte (2001) analysis of the rapid growth and implications of Latin Americans living in Indianapolis during the 1990s, and a recent study on the natives' responses to Latin Americans in the university town of Bloomington, Indiana (Levinson *et al*, 2007).

As a result of the dramatic increase of Latin Americans in this city, the number of businesses directed to the Latin American population has multiplied. Not only are new Spanish radio and TV stations, restaurants and ethnic food stores emerging to serve this population, but other already established and less ''ethnic'' businesses are adapting in order to attract Latin American customers. In addition, the use of the Spanish language has become widespread in areas of the city where a large population of Latin Americans resides and within state agencies, health-care facilities and other institutions that deal directly with this population on a regular basis.

This situation has produced different reactions from the natives and older residents of Indiana (the term ''Indiana natives'' is used in this article to refer to the established residents of Indiana and those who are not recent international immigrants).[1] While some people welcome this increased diversity, the most prevalent reactions, as reflected in the media (local newspapers, TV, radio and the Internet), tend to be negative - including outright rejection of immigrants from Latin America, concerns about losing their cultural identity (depicting the immigrants as ''colonizing the US way of Life'' and ''destroying our heritage''), fear that immigrants are taking jobs from US citizens and draining government budgets by reaping public benefits, and the portrayal of immigrants as carriers of diseases, or as criminals. In fact, reproducing a discourse that seems to prevail with differing degrees of intensity in many other places described in the

[1] The term Hoosier would be appropriate here, but some readers might find it too colloquial. The term White Americans is often used, but many Latin Americans consider themselves also white Americans; furthermore, the perceptions of prejudice and discrimination are not only related to White Americans or the Anglos. Indeed, the in-depth interviews revealed that some Latin Americans perceived discrimination against them by African-Americans. Therefore, it seems that Indiana natives (referring to established residents of Indiana) is the best alternative in the context of this research, although not a perfect one.

above- mentioned literature; what Chavez (2008, 21) describes as the ‘‘Latino threat narrative’’ espoused by anti-immigrant intellectuals, politicians, and most of the mainstream media (21).

Within this context, how do the Latin American immigrants residing in the city of Indianapolis perceive their interactions with the Indiana natives? The purpose of this study was to provide an understanding of the perceptions and experiences of prejudice and discrimination experienced by these Latin Americans, and to explore some of the factors that affect these perceptions and experiences. Where possible we compare these perceptions with theories and findings from other studies.

By providing a picture of the Latin American immigrants' experiences, the findings of this study contribute to the understanding of what this ‘‘new’’ immigration has meant for the immigrants themselves and at the same time add to our understanding of the immigration process in similar emerging metropolitan cities that have not traditionally attracted large numbers of Latin American immigrants. The experiences of these immigrants not only shed light on how the native population is responding to their increasing presence, but is of critical importance in analyzing how well they are likely to adapt to their new environment and the nature of intergroup relations.

Analytical framework

Based on the writings of Marger (2003) and Mason (1970), we define prejudice as an arbitrary belief or feeling toward an ethnic group or its individual members. Specifically, prejudice involves a judgment, based on a fixed mental image of some ethic group or national origin and applied to all individuals of that ethnic group or nationality without being tested against reality. In other words, prejudice is a generalized belief, a preconceived notion based on emotions and feelings – usually negative – that is applied to all members of a particular group. This includes in this research what are commonly considered racist expressions such as ‘‘wetback,’’ ‘‘bandido,’’ ‘‘go back to Mexico,’’ and so on. It also implies, as Rocco (2004) suggests, a narrative that constructs the Latin American immigrants as ‘‘perpetual foreigners.’’

While prejudice refers to attitudes toward immigrants, discrimination involves behavior aimed at denying members of particular ethnic groups or nationality equal access to social rewards (Marger, 2003). Therefore, discrimination in this study refers to practices by natives of Indiana that have a negative impact on individuals from Latin America living in the city of Indianapolis. Discrimination entails both effects and mechanisms (Feagin and Feagin, 1978). That is, impacts of discriminatory behavior, and modes of operation or techniques by which it is carried out. As Antonovsky (1960, 821) explains, discrimination is a situation in which individuals are denied desired and expected rewards or opportunities for reasons related not to their capacities, merit or behavior, but solely because of membership in an identifiable out-group.

Discrimination is not always overt, nor does it necessarily entail intentional actions. Sometimes people act in a discriminatory manner toward immigrants without even realizing it. As a result,

the forms of discrimination studied here include soft or minor forms of discrimination, which render psychological damage of some nature to individuals (such as pejorative ethnic or national references, derogatory comments, rude or discourteous behavior, and so on) as well as more serious forms of discrimination, such as the denial of access to jobs, housing, education, or justice.

Scholars of ethnic relations often classify discrimination into two major types: individual and institutional. Actions carried out by individuals or small groups constitute one type, and actions instigated as a result of the norms and structures of organizations and institutions constitute the other. Individual discrimination occurs, for example, when individuals in certain positions of power deny equal access to promotion and salary increases or fail to assign highly regarded tasks to a person from a minority background. In both types, discrimination can be direct or indirect. Our research concentrates on direct and indirect institutional discrimination and direct and indirect individual discrimination as perceived by the immigrants themselves.

Our basic premise is that prejudice and discrimination are learned patterns of thought and action and this learning process is directly tied to the society in which individuals are socialized, as normative theory suggests. The essence of normative theory is clearly explained by Westie: ''Individuals are prejudiced because they are raised in societies that have prejudice as a facet of the normative system of their culture. Prejudice is built into the culture in the form of normative precepts – that is, notions of 'ought to be' – which define the ways in which members of the group ought to behave in relation to the members of selected outgroups'' (1964, 583–584). In other words, it is to the individuals' social environment – the groups to which they belong, the cultural and political norms operative in their society and community, and the process of socialization – that discrimination and prejudice can be traced to (for example, Westie, 1964; Williams, 1964; Porter, 1971). Given the environment in which natives from Indiana grew up – little history or experience with Latin Americans – an ethnocentric response to immigrants is to be expected.

A particular social environment depends on ideas circulating throughout society and these ideas result to a large extent from historical processes. For instance, historically, the US policies on immigration have always imposed restrictions and quotas on groups that were highly unlike the dominant group in culture or physical appearance. In the same manner, immigrants, whose origins were culturally and physically close to those of the dominant group have enjoyed not only easier entrance, but also more rapid and less impeded upward mobility (McLemore *et al*, 2000; Marger, 2003). Therefore, we expected that the more different in appearance the immigrant group was (that is, the more ''visible''),[2] the more prejudice and discrimination it would experience in Indianapolis. In addition, we anticipated that the extent to which immigrants

[2] We use the term ''Visible immigrant'' in this research as a value neutral-term for Hispanics non-white or non-Caucasian immigrants, as it is commonly used in the literature on immigration (for example, Lackland, 1992; Marger, 2003), but also in terms of their external appearance such as type of clothing that clearly identifies them as different from the natives of Indiana.

perceive and/or experience prejudice and discrimination would vary according to the length of time individuals have been in the area and according to their socio-economic status.[3]

Prejudice and discrimination are also tied to language abilities of the immigrants, as Fore (2006), Lippi-Green (1997), Oboler (1995) and some polls reveal (Craighill, 2007). For instance, Lippi-Green writes:

> People are judged on the basis of language form rather than language content, every day. Without hesitation or contemplation, workers are turned away, children are corrected, people are made to feel small and unimportant in public settings. The process of language subordination is so deeply rooted, so well established, that we do not see it for what it is. We make no excuses for preferences which exclude on the basis of immutable language traits. (1997, 241)

This author demonstrates that for mainstream America, certain accents are disliked while others are valued. As a radio commentator from Los Angeles expressed: ‘‘everyone knows a British accent gets you invited to lunch, but a Mexican accent gets you dirty looks’’ (Morrison, 1994). The process of language subordination targets only those types of languages that are representative of differences in race, ethnicity or homeland, which are considered inferior. Lippi-Green provides a theoretical and empirical map that informed the research on this issue. Furthermore, legal cases, in other states reflect the existence of a considerable level of discrimination based on language; for example, the cases of *Fragante v. the City and County of Honolulu*, and *Houston v. the Pennsylvania Department of Education*. The group that wields more power in the society would determine ultimately what the proper accent, or the dominant language should be.

Indeed, prejudice and discrimination are also connected to competition for resources. The power resource theory developed half a century ago by Blumer (1958), and later by Wilson (1973) still offers a very valuable tool to inform the analysis of the relations between immigrants and natives in contemporary society, even though this is only indirectly addressed in this research. Finally, we will contrast the existence of prejudice and discrimination with the ideas circulating through the media. Although there is still debate over the nature of the media’s exact effect on socialization, few researchers will deny that it plays a major role in the transmission of ideas about the world (Gerbner *et al*, 1977; Ball-Rokeach *et al*, 1984; Felson, 1996). The mass media are the main means by which people interpret the structures and events of their society, and they provide images and representations to which individuals might not otherwise be exposed. As Marger writes: ‘‘because their techniques are so pervasive, the media as socializers may supersede in some ways even the family and school’’ (2003, 73). Content analysis research of television, such as Aguirre and Baker (2000), Méndez-Méndez and Alverio (2001), Navarrete

[3] Several studies indicate that the higher the socioeconomic status of the immigrants and the longer they have been living in a given town, the lesser the prejudice and discrimination they will experience (for example, Smith, 1981; Jaret, 1995; Farley, 2000).

and Kamasaki (1994), Subervi (2004) and Montalvo (2006), indicates that there is considerable lack of media sensitivity to minorities in this country, and particularly with regard to Latin American immigrants. In fact, these studies by Aguirre and Baker (2000), and Navarrete and Kamasaki (1994), as well as others by Alba and Moore (1982) indicate that the US news media is very selective with regard to what is reported to the public. For instance, the race, ethnicity, or national origin of crime victims and their victimizers ''often determine how the media will report crime.''

The Research Study

To examine experiences with prejudice and discrimination, we draw on data collected from a non-random sample of 143 Latin American immigrants residing in the greater Indianapolis area. Data from 85 of these immigrants were initially collected as part of a larger study of foreigners residing in the area. Since no good sampling frame exists for locating this population, every effort was made to include in the study substantial variation in terms of country of origin, length of time in the area, age, gender, and socioeconomic status. Eligible individuals were contacted either through their membership in local nationality associations, attendance at local churches, attendance at local international and cultural events, or through personal contacts, and given or sent a survey questionnaire (either in Spanish or English) to fill out and mail back in a self-addressed, postage paid envelope. The questionnaire contained 101 questions addressing a wide range of topics relevant to immigrant experiences, in particular, information about prejudice and discrimination. Most of these questions were closed-ended; however, several open-ended questions were also included, asking the respondents to provide specific examples of their experiences with prejudice and discrimination.

To better understand the experiences of this growing population, face-to-face in-depth interviews were conducted with an additional 58 Latin American immigrants identified through the same avenues used in the earlier study. The in-depth interviews were completed in either Spanish or English over a two-year time period (2003–2005). While the authors completed the majority of the in-depth interviews, three student workers were trained as research assistants and worked under the direct supervision of the authors. Since we wished to combine the data from these interviews with the data collected in the earlier study, the interview protocol included both a short version of the original questionnaire (that is, the structured questions of specific relevance to understanding this population's demographics and experiences with prejudice and discrimination) to maintain consistency, and a set of unstructured open-ended questions.

The latter questions enabled us to obtain detailed qualitative information concerning the extent and nature of the prejudice and discrimination experienced by Latin American immigrants to the area. As such, these qualitative accounts provide a much richer, more extensive view of their experiences and feelings, allowing us to go beyond the information obtained through just the survey questionnaire itself. In all subsequent analysis, quantified responses are based on the

structured questions and reflect the total combined sample, and the qualitative responses are based largely on the data from the in-depth qualitative interviews.[4]

Participation in both phases of the data collection process was completely voluntary, and responses were anonymous. As with most research in which participation is voluntary, there remains the possibility that respondents with certain characteristics and attitudes would be more likely to participate in the study. While it is not possible to know exactly who these individuals are, it is possible that undocumented immigrants were less likely to have participated (even though we made every possible effort to include them). However, an examination of the characteristics of the individuals who did participate indicates that the sample reflects the diversity within the immigrant population in Indiana, and as discussed below, compares favorably with the census profile of Latin American immigrants living in Indianapolis in most characteristics.

There is no method of data collection that will allow us to estimate with complete accuracy the frequency of prejudice and discrimination experienced by immigrants (for example, people do not always know whether they have been discriminated against). Perceptions of experiences with prejudice and discrimination do, nevertheless, represent an important psychosocial reality for immigrants, regardless of their adequacy as social indicators of the ‘‘actual’’ amount of discrimination and intolerance in Indiana. As such, the data collected do allow us to demonstrate whether or not instances of ethnic prejudice in the city of Indianapolis are customary or sparse isolated instances, to identify some of the factors that affect these perceptions and experiences, and give us a sense of their likely impact on social relations. Document analysis was also used to complement the data collected through the survey and individual interviews, to provide a more holistic view of Latin American immigrants' experiences.

First we present a brief descriptive analysis of the immigrants' characteristics, we continue with the data on immigrants' perceptions of prejudice and discrimination, then we show concrete examples of how the media and intellectuals contribute to create a negative environment that might stimulate prejudice and discrimination among the population at large, and finally we relate our main findings with the other research in the Midwest and with general theories of relations between immigrants and natives.

[4] A comparison of the data obtained during the initial study and from the interviews indicated that while there were slightly more females in the latter sample, they were similar on the other major demographic characteristics. While the interviews are the primary data source for the respondents' accounts of their experiences with prejudice and discrimination, in several cases the participants in the initial study included detailed comments and examples of the discrimination they had experienced in response to the open-ended questions on the questionnaire.

Findings

Characteristics of the Latin American immigrants

The Latin American immigrants in our study came from 14 different countries and consistent with state census figures (US Bureau of the Census, 2000), the largest percentage of Latin Americans in our sample came either from Mexico (58 percent), Central America, or the Caribbean. Thirty-eight percent of the participants were currently citizens of the United States.

Forty-five per cent of the respondents were male, the median age was 35 years and 68.4 percent indicated that they were currently married. About a quarter of the sample had a high school degree (24.4 percent) and 19.3 percent had less than high school education. Seventy-two percent of the sample was employed full-time and 59 percent had family incomes of less than $35,000 per year. While the socio-economic status of the immigrants in our sample is slightly higher compared to the US average (US Census Bureau, 2000), this finding is consistent with available data concerning Latin American immigrants in the Indianapolis area. Even though a substantial majority of immigrants work in low-paying jobs, there is also a proportion of these immigrants who came to the local area to work in the relatively high-paying technology jobs (for example, in companies such as Eli Lilly, Thomson, Allison, Rolls Royce) or to attend one of several universities in the area. The United Way Indianapolis Area Survey (UWCI, 2000), for example, found a similar pattern with 22 percent of the Latin Americans in their study occupying a managerial/ professional position.

The average number of years the respondents had lived in Indiana was just over 10. However, 51 percent of the respondents were recent immigrants to Indianapolis, having been in the city for less than 6 years. In agreement with official estimates concerning the changing nature of the immigrant population in the state of Indiana (US Census Bureau, 2000), only 52 percent of the respondents in our study had come to Indianapolis directly from their own country. Those individuals who did not emigrate directly from Latin America to Indianapolis had lived previously in one of the other states of the United States.

Consistent with Frey's (2002) hypothesis that Latin American immigrants are moving to non-traditional areas in response to better job opportunities, the most frequent reason given for coming to Indianapolis was for job-related reasons (58 percent). The second and third most often stated reasons for coming to Indianapolis were to attend school (11 percent) and to reunite with family members (10 percent). However, the majority of the immigrants indicated that they knew someone here when they arrived: either a family member (close and distant relative) 27 percent, friends and acquaintances 28 percent, or work colleagues 8 percent.

Therefore, in addition to economic reasons, immigrants choose to come to Indiana as a result of a mix of what Massey (1999) calls cumulative causation and Bourdieu (1986) and Coleman (1988) define as social capital. Those already here constitute a network that makes the move to Indiana easier for the new immigrant and facilitates finding work. This network of family and friends has

facilitated the augmentation of new immigrants into the area, which in turn has served to further increase the demand for more immigrant workers as the population grows. In sum, this process is self-perpetuating, because each act of migration creates a social structure capable of promoting additional movement. This ''chain migration'' links Indiana with certain regions of Latin America. For example, a considerable proportion of Mexicans living in Indiana come from the same area in Jalisco, Mexico, and in particular, a small town of 60,000 inhabitants, Tala in central Jalisco, has sent to Indiana one fifth of its population (Snodgrass, 2007).

Furthermore, the interviews suggested that other factors directly related to the quality of life were of substantial importance in the immigrant's decision to come to the Indianapolis area, especially among the secondary immigrants (those who came to Indiana from another area of the United States).[5] Indiana was seen by the immigrants as a good place to live and raise children with its comparatively low crime rate, ''peaceful/laid back lifestyle,'' ''low cost of living,'' and ''relatively affordable housing'' (compared with other areas such as California or the East Coast). In short, as in the general motives for immigrating internationally, a mix of push-and-pull factors also characterizes this secondary immigration. While approximately 34 percent of the immigrants in Indianapolis considered themselves to be permanently settled in Indiana, many hoped to either move to a different area of the United States (28 percent) or to return to their home country at some point in the future (32 percent).

The immigrants in our study came from communities that ranged from large urban centers such as Mexico City to small villages, from areas with a considerable amount of industrial development, to poor areas that are agriculture based. This finding reinforces the conclusion of Massey and Zenteno (1999) that both underdevelopment and development produce immigration. For example, many Mexicans who are displaced from traditional livelihoods, like agriculture, decide to emigrate, but there are also those people who lose their jobs due to a number of national industries being forced to close down because they were not technologically prepared to compete with the more technologically savvy industries, mostly coming from abroad, which have installed their factories in Mexico.

Experiences with prejudice

A number of different questions were used to assess the immigrants' perceptions of prejudice. In response to the question, ''How do you think people in Indiana feel about immigrants?'' A considerable proportion of respondents from Latin America believed that Indiana residents disliked them (23 percent), that they were indifferent to immigrants (24 percent), or that they were unwilling to form close relationships with them (47 percent). Another question asked how immigrants believe that natives view themselves in relation to them. In response to this question 37 percent thought that people from Indiana saw themselves as superior to immigrants and 29 percent thought they were viewed as equal. The last question on this issue addressed how

[5] Smith and Mannon (2006) define ''secondary immigration'' as domestic migration of people born abroad after their initial arrival to the United States.

strongly immigrants agreed or disagreed with the statement that Indiana is a racist state. Forty-two percent of the respondents strongly agreed or agreed with this statement (while 31 percent neither agreed nor disagreed, and 27 percent disagreed). These results indicate that a considerable proportion of immigrants perceive some form of prejudice against them. No significant differences in immigrant perceptions of prejudice by demographic characteristics or the length of time the immigrants were in Indiana were found. However, the relationship between length of time in Indiana and the question asking how the respondents believe the Indiana natives view themselves in relation to them approached statistical significance. Those who had been in Indiana for less than 6 years were more likely to believe that the natives saw themselves as superior to them (chi-square = 44.5, df = 2, $P < 0.11$). Furthermore, the evidence from the in-depth interviews suggests that the visible immigrants (for example, those most different in appearance) were the most likely to perceive prejudice against them; 65 percent of those who declared to have experienced prejudice. The following statements reflect these perceptions:

> At work some people say negative things about me, even in front of me. Like I am not as good a worker as Americans, or that I do not have what it takes to be successful in this society.
>
> Some people will tell me: you need to speak English, I do not understand you, even though I did learn enough English to communicate, I have been here for five years, but I still have an accent.

Prejudice is very difficult to eliminate not only because it is often learned since childhood, but more importantly because it is constantly reproduced in the media by journalists, politicians in their declarations, and anti-immigrant intellectuals, activists and others. The media effect is particularly important when the personal contact between immigrants and the rest of the population is rather limited, as seems to be the case in Indianapolis. Our data indicate that a considerable proportion of immigrants interact with Indiana natives only at work. When asked how often they socialized with Indiana natives, the vast majority indicated little to no informal contact. Forty percent of the respondents indicated that they did so rarely or never and 32 percent did so once a month. In this context, the media are likely the chief agents of transmission and reproduction of stereotypes and prejudices about these immigrants.

Negative stereotypes of immigrants presented in the media are widespread in all areas of public life. In fact, immigration is a topic constantly present in the media. As Chavez writes, ‘‘debates over immigration, citizenship, and national belonging are informed by the events we witness through the media’s representation of immigrants’’ (2008, 5). The media base their coverage on their own so-called ‘‘experts,’’ but also rely heavily on political debates and scholars’ writings. We will briefly review some of the most relevant debates and publications that have framed the negative views on immigration during the last two decades. Richard Lamn (1990), in a testimony before the US House of Representatives Judiciary Committee’s Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees, and International Law, suggested that immigration would worsen America’s problems

in education, health care and the environment. Anti-immigration activists Stacy Palmer and Wayne Lutton (1988) wrote: ‘‘There is scarcely a community in America that has gone untouched by alien-related crime.’’ Garret Harding (1990), a professor at the University of California, argues that immigration can be the death of the free enterprise and harms the US economy in general. Robert N. Hopkins (1990), referring to immigrants from Latin America, wrote that Third World immigrants could not adapt to the United States. In a very explicit racist tone, he suggested that these people were inherently unable to live in democracy. As evidence of this he pointed out ‘‘their past of dictatorships.’’ Reproducing basic stereotypes of authoritarianism and using racist propositions, he goes on to argue that Costa Rica is a notable exception to patterns of dictatorship in Latin America because it ‘‘is virtually a European country.’’ His writings reflect not only primitive racism, but also gross ignorance of the ethnic make-up of Costa Rica and the rest of Latin America. Furthermore, Hopkins forgets to mention, or wants to ignore, that many of those dictators were often kept in power with the direct help of the United States. Former politician and TV commentator Patrick J. Buchanan has long been an opponent of Latin American immigration to the United States, and has written extensively on the subject. In his book the *Death of the West* (2002), he claims that Mexicans cannot assimilate to the United States, not only for cultural reasons but mostly for biological ones. He writes, ‘‘Mexicans not only come from another culture, but millions are of another race. History and experience teach us that different races are far more difficult to assimilate’’ (125). This type of primitive eighteenth-century argument (revealing gross ignorance of what race is) would be laughable if it was not taken seriously in the electronic media and broadcast to millions of viewers. The supposed negative impact of Latin American immigrants, and Mexicans in particular, on US society is also a preoccupation of well-known Harvard professor, Samuel Huntington. In a book (2004a, b) and an article published in *Foreign Policy* the same year, he asserts that Mexicans cannot assimilate and that they are taking back the southwest of the United States. Even self-proclaimed liberals, also from Harvard, such as Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr (1992) raised a concern over the social separatism that bilingual education could create as a result of the massive immigration from Latin America.

Local organizations such as the Indiana Federation for Immigration Reform & Enforcement (IFIRE) have also played an important role in disseminating negative stereotypes of immigrants. For instance, John Hanton, a leader in this organization, already 20 years ago was warning of a destructive ‘‘Latin onslaught’’ coming to the United States (Beirich, 2008). The Midwest Coalition to Reduce Immigration (2008) posts in its website an estimate of the cost to tax payers of today’s immigration that seems rather wild and inaccurate, from $30 to 60 million, without much explanation on how they obtained those numbers. They use statements by Senator Gaylord Nelson (presented as Earth Day Founder), and every possible stereotype about immigrants to promote their views.

Official policies could also play a role in promoting a negative view of immigrants. For instance, a study by the General Accounting Office found that the provisions established by the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) had caused ‘‘widespread discrimination’’ against people with ‘‘a foreign appearance or accent’’ (Bowsher, 1990). After 9/11, the debates that

followed in the political arena related to immigration have probably also contributed to expand an anti-immigrant sentiment among large sectors of the US population.

Whether deliberate or not, the media tends to present Latin Americans as ‘‘them’’ versus ‘‘us,’’ ghettoizing them in a stereotypical ‘‘barrio’’ (Méndez- Méndez and Alverio, 2001), emphasizing on undocumented immigrants (Subervi, 2004) and to commemorate the Anglo-dominant culture in US society, thereby emphasizing the model of total assimilation of the immigrants to the dominant group. Given the reinforcing role of the media and a general environment of intolerance to differences, and a widespread fear of different ethnic groups and nationalities, many Indiana natives tend to mistrust immigrants. This mistrust stems in part from racist ideologies and nativism, but it is also grounded on ignorance and lack of a historical perspective. For example, an argument often heard in public debates and declarations is that ‘‘Hispanics seem to keep their own culture’’ and ‘‘they do not become part of the mainstream quickly enough,’’ an idea often reinforced by the media, as the Méndez-Méndez and Alverio (2001) report suggests. In reality, research shows (National Council of La Raza, 1986) that most children of Hispanic immigrants are becoming culturally and structurally assimilated to the US mainstream. In general, among the children of immigrants English becomes the first and most often spoken language.

The fact that a considerable proportion of adult immigrants do not assimilate as quick could also be reinforced by the attitudes of the natives. For example, if people do not feel welcome, they might tend to seek refuge in the groups where they feel accepted. That is, other Latin Americans. In other words, prejudice creates distance between locals and the immigrants, who in turn would feel compelled to seek comfort among other people from the same national or ethnic origin, making social integration less likely. Seventy-six percent of the Latin American immigrants interviewed indicated that they do not feel integrated into the local community:

> Although most people tend to be superficially nice, I feel like I will never be part of the community. I have been here for 14 years and people constantly remind me that I am a foreigner. Sometimes they do it subtlety and sometimes very openly.

Certainly these negative perceptions could also be expressed in acts of discrimination. According to Blumrosen and Blumrosen (2000), attitudes toward Latin American immigrants are predominantly negative in Indiana, and sometimes this negative attitude results in discrimination. In the next section we concentrate on immigrants’ perceptions of discrimination.

Experiences with discrimination

In our survey questionnaire and interview guide we included two general questions on discrimination and several questions addressing the presence of discrimination in specific areas of life. When asked the general question concerning how serious they felt the problem of discrimination to be in Indiana, almost half the immigrants indicated that it was a somewhat serious or very serious problem. When asked if the respondent himself/herself had ever felt

discriminated against, specifically because he/she was a foreigner, 62 percent answered in the affirmative. There was not a significant difference in the perception of discrimination according to the number of years that the individuals had lived in Indiana, nor by income, which is contrary to what we expected. We found, however, a significant difference according to the level of education. Although a relatively high percentage of immigrants at all levels of education reported having experienced discrimination, those with less than high school education were the most likely to perceive discrimination to be a somewhat or very serious problem (6.28, df = 1, $P < 0.012$). Men were also more likely than women to perceive discrimination as a serious or very serious problem (chi-square = 2.72, df = 1, $P < 0.10$).

In addition, those respondents who indicated they had personally experienced discrimination were asked to give examples of the specific instances in which discrimination had occurred. The three most common specific forms of discrimination indicated were discrimination in stores and restaurants including discourtesy, excessive scrutiny and denying credit (28 percent), job discrimination (19 percent), and discrimination by service providers and public officials, such as police officers (14 percent). Many respondents indicated discrimination of a more general form – in terms of their relationships with others (25 percent) or because of their language (22 percent).

Regarding their experiences at work, 30 percent of all respondents said that they were passed over for a job promotion, and 36 percent indicated that they knew of someone at their workplace that had not been promoted because of their nationality. The percentage of participants who responded to the general question that they felt discriminated at work is lower because some individuals probably did not consider the fact of not being promoted when it was their turn as a case of discrimination.

Instances of discrimination are not always clear-cut, but the in-depth interviews provided some detailed information, which allowed us to better evaluate the immigrants' feelings of discrimination. The following exemplifies some of the situations that interviewees experienced: one interviewee revealed that she received consistently very good evaluations on her yearly performance reviews. However, after 6 years in the job she realized that many of her colleagues – who entered the company under similar circumstances and with similar credentials as her – were promoted, including some who came to the company after her. When she asked her supervisor why she was not being taken into consideration for promotion, even though she received consistently excellent evaluations, the answer was that she had never been in a leadership position on any project. The logical question that she asked herself then was: Why was not she considered for a leadership position on those projects? This is a very illustrative example of the self-fulfilling prophecy. Because of prejudice concerning the ability of a Hispanic to perform, the supervisor does not put the person in challenging tasks, then he/she justifies not promoting that person by referring to the fact that she was kept out of the tasks that would actually help her to be promoted. Many other testimonies of perceived discrimination in the work place are illustrated in the following quotes:

> I have not had a salary increase in two years, while all the other workers who are Americans did receive an increase.
>
> My direct supervisor blocked all the opportunities that came my way for a promotion. Other co-workers who hated immigrants made life very hard for me.
>
> I have to work twice as hard to get the same promotion as the American workers. Besides, I was told by my immediate supervisor that I did not have the work ethic of an American to make it.
>
> In the job they tend to give me the worse tasks to do, even though I am qualified to do better jobs than some of my American co-workers.

The report of Blumrosen and Blumrosen (2000) on intentional job discrimination in metropolitan America reveals a considerable number of cases of job discrimination against Latin Americans in several industries and service jobs in Indianapolis and other cities of Indiana. For instance, only during the year 1999 there were 1200 Latin American workers affected by job discrimination in Indianapolis alone; and one has to keep in mind that most cases are not reported.

As indicated above, discrimination in stores and restaurants constitutes another important obstacle that the immigrants encounter in order to live a dignified life in Indiana. Following are some examples of discrimination in stores and restaurants reported by the interviewees:

> I was in a store waiting to be served and when I realized that many people that came after me were served first I told the attendant very politely that it was my turn. He replied that the white people were served first in this store. One day I stopped at a Kentucky Fried Chicken in the South Side for lunch and the cashier told me that she was not taking my order because she did not like people like me.
>
> Many times I have been followed closely in stores, probably thinking that I might steal something.
>
> When I go to stores they do not treat me with due respect. They make me wait more than normal. They serve others who look American first.

Regarding housing discrimination, the following quote reflects the opinion of the majority of interviewees:

> Well, when I arrived I had to share a house with friends, but after a year I was doing OK economically and I brought my wife and my 4 years old daughter, and I wanted to live in a better neighborhood. I went to several apartment complexes on the West Side who had signs that said ‘‘for rent’’, and the answer was that they did not have a two bedroom apartment available at the time or that they had just rented the last one available that

> morning. I had all the papers proving that I had a steady job, but they never even asked for it. It has been so hard that I had to settle here in this area of town. (South-West of Indianapolis, where many Latin Americans live)

Even though most interviewees who lived in other cities in the United States before coming to Indianapolis said that the houses were in better condition here in general, many still felt that they can only find housing in relatively run-down buildings and only in certain neighborhoods.

Low income alone cannot fully account for the discrimination and the resulting relatively poor housing conditions in which many Latin Americans live in Indianapolis. Studies in other areas of the country suggest that when common factors, such as financial resources, are taken into account, differences in housing conditions still remain (Brown-Graham, 1999). Some interviewees thought that it was easier for them to buy a house than to rent an apartment in certain neighborhoods.

However, it is important to recognize the significant diversity among Latin Americans and their very distinct experiences with housing based on their physical appearances, particularly those who were dark skinned and looked more native ‘‘Indian’’ reported experiencing discrimination in the private housing market more than those who were white (in a ratio of 2/1 among those who declared having experienced discrimination). Language abilities seemed also to be a factor. This is not unique to discrimination in housing. In the qualitative interviews one could determine that visible minorities were the most likely to report discrimination also in stores and restaurants (in similar ratio of 2 to 1). Furthermore, those who had arrived in Indiana fairly recently (less than 6 years ago) and those with the least amount of education, as indicated before, were more likely to report discrimination in stores, restaurants, and in housing.

A considerable percentage of Latin American immigrants perceived discrimination by police officers. Forty-three percent stated that unfair treatment by the police was a fairly common or very common occurrence in Indianapolis. Males and those who had been in Indiana less than 6 years were more likely than their counterparts to indicate that unfair treatment by the police of foreigners was a problem (chi-square = 6.37, df = 3, $P < 0.07$ and chi-square = 9.15, df = 3, $P < 0.03$, respectively). When asked if they themselves had had a direct experience of unfair treatment by the police, 19 percent said yes; they perceived an inappropriate and disrespectful attitude of police officers. The quotes below illustrate some of these experiences:

> I was trying to get odd jobs when I first came to Indiana. I was in a neighborhood asking if they needed someone to mow the lawn, and an officer came and interrogated me, treating me like I was a criminal.

> After being stopped because we were driving over the speed limit by four miles, the police officer shouted at us and told us to go back to our country.

A considerable proportion of the respondents in our study (22 percent) indicated that they thought that language difficulties were at the root of the discriminatory behaviors on the part of Indiana natives. The language difficulties they experienced were often directly related to having a foreign accent and how others treated them because of this. For instance:

> Most North Americans tend to think that you are dumb because one has a different accent. I feel it at work all the time. They do not pay attention to what I say.
>
> People are often impolite or laugh about my accent.
>
> I do not speak good English, so they treat me like I am inferior.

These quotes are examples of a perceived superiority of the Indiana natives and how language subordination is developed. Language subordination does not say, for instance, that Julia cannot tell a joke, but rather that Julia ''is not worth listening to because her English makes it clear that she was born in an inferior country'' (Lippi-Green, 1997, 243). The negative impact of a Hispanic accent in Indiana is considerable.[6] In this state, as in the United States in general, it seems that this accent is stigmatized and there is no hesitation to act on prejudice associated with it. Many Indiana natives consider it legitimate to discriminate on the basis of language.

A high degree of education does not necessarily bring with it any protection from discrimination that is based on a foreign accent. Among those reporting discrimination on the basis of their accent, 46 percent where highly educated (university degrees) and had a high-paying job. In fact, rejecting someone on the basis of his/her accent is seen by many as something objective and rightful, and is not viewed as a form of discrimination. The following anecdote is revealing of this attitude. A sales supervisor for a car dealership in the North Side of Indianapolis (a relatively wealthy area) told one of our research assistants that he would never hire anyone with a foreign accent, and especially not a Mexican. When asked why, the person said: ''It is a question of business. No one would buy a car from a guy with a Mexican accent.'' The fact is that several small dealerships have developed in the South-West part of Indianapolis to serve the Latin American community. This reveals a certain tendency to ghettoize certain types of businesses.

The ideology of the ''proper accent'' is so widespread and accepted as common sense that rejecting someone in a public way on the basis of a foreign accent can be done without much notice, as ''normal.'' Many respondents reported this type of behavior:

> I was in a store and I asked something to the attendant who responded that she did not understand my English and added that I could not stay in this country if I did not learn to speak properly.

[6] The use of the term ''Spanish accent'' refers to Spanish- speaking countries in general, not to a particular country.

To be sure, as Lippi-Green (1997) suggests, language subordination is not always as openly affirmed as in the above quote. It often works in more subtle ways. But people are rejected for jobs because their native language makes it difficult for them to speak with the ‘‘proper accent’’; because their intonations are Hispanic.

Expressions such as: ‘‘They come here and they want to work here right? Well, they have to learn English and adapt to our culture,’’ are common in Indiana. Most Indiana natives, like most people in the United States have no doubt in their minds that assimilation is the path to success; ‘‘economic rationalization is the most often raised, most loudly voiced, and the most classic of all common-sense arguments used to coerce the few into the ways of the many’’ (Lippi-Green, 1997, 241).

The limitations imposed on immigrants by a standard language ideology create in them a continuous feeling of inadequacy that can last as long as they live in this country. Indeed, as research has shown (Pinker, 1995), demanding that the immigrants assimilate linguistically (without accent) is demanding something impossible to accomplish. Pinker and Lippi-Green have substantiated that a person’s accent (the bundle of distinctive intonation and phonological features) is fixed, or hard-wired in the mind, and once past a certain age (generally mid-20s) it can only be very laboriously changed to a very limited degree, regardless of commitment, intelligence, ability, and resources.

The pressure to force immigrants to adapt to the dominant group and to their culture and language is not always openly and formally established. It works often in an informal and indirect manner, but it is still an efficient process that coerces consent and participation from the immigrants. Indeed, the imposition of an ideology is most effective when its workings are less visible. As a result, most immigrants attend to conform and to assimilate. For instance, many Latin-American immigrants have expressed to the researchers that they do not want to speak Spanish at home in order to better assimilate their children to the US mainstream. Some would even say with a touch of haughtiness and snobbism: ‘‘my children do not speak Spanish.’’

Conclusion

The main findings of our research pertain to the degree of prejudice and discrimination Latin American immigrants believe they have confronted in Indianapolis. A substantial proportion of the immigrants in our study indicated that they considered Indiana natives to be prejudiced and that they had personally experienced discrimination. They volunteered specific examples of prejudice and discrimination that they had experienced. Our results are consistent with trends found in other studies, which document the existence of discrimination in employment (Blumrosen and Blumrosen, 2000), in housing (US Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2002; United States Department of Justice, Fair Housing, 2008), in restaurants and stores (United States Department of Justice, 2008), and in the immigrants’ relations with law enforcement officers (Joge and Pérez, 2004). Additionally, they also feel a sense of inadequacy due to their inability to speak what is considered by natives to be ‘‘proper English.’’

In these aspects the new immigration process in Indianapolis has been similar to findings in other studies of Latin American immigration to the Midwest mentioned previously (that is, Stull *et al*, 1992; Broadway, 1994; Driever, 2004; Millard *et al*, 2004b; Gouveia *et al*, 2005; Rich and Miranda, 2005), although due to differences in methodology and approaches we cannot compare exactly the levels of prejudice and discrimination with these studies. For instance, our findings coincide with the study of Millard et al (2004b) in terms of the persistence of prejudice, although it differs as to the proportion of people who perceived prejudice (they state that all their interviewees experienced racism). This difference is probably due to the fact that we are studying immigrants in an urban area while the Millard *et al* study deals with the rural Midwest.

Our research confirms that levels of prejudice and discrimination change according to the ethnicity of the immigrant. The variables most likely to affect perceptions of prejudice and discrimination are physical features and difficulties with the English language. The visible Latin American immigrants were most likely to report having experienced some form of discrimination while living in Indianapolis. Furthermore, it appears that the discrimination experienced by these immigrants is not a result of clear-cut institutional discrimination, but rather individual discrimination. At least the data we have from our research does not allow us to deduct the existence of a formal institutional discrimination. Since direct institutional discrimination in most settings in the United States is forbidden, most acts of discrimination, if they exist, are covert, and therefore, difficult to detect by the subjects.

Latin American immigrants' experiences with prejudice and discrimination reflect the premises of the normative theories. Indeed, discrimination, rather than the thoughts or actions of a deviant few, ''is a conforming response to social positions in which people find themselves'' (Marger, 2003, 87). For instance, people perceive a certain accent and forms of speech as the norm, when others deviate from that norm, as most immigrants do, individuals feel compelled to think according to that norm and to evaluate negatively those speaking with a foreign accent. Thus, as stated earlier, it is to the individuals' social environment that prejudice and discrimination can be traced (Williams, 1964). The social environment includes the groups to which people belong, the cultural norms operating in their society, and the process of socialization through which they learn the norms, values and beliefs of their society. In fact, people who discriminate or express prejudice against a foreigner are not always aware that their actions or attitudes are discriminatory or prejudiced in any way. Their behavior and attitudes emerge out of their social experiences. In other words, if prejudice and discrimination are enmeshed in the norms and values of the society or community within which the individual interact, there are many chances that they will be adopted by a majority of individuals in the same way that they ''learn to eat with a knife and a fork rather than with their bare hands'' (Marger, 2003, 89).

Furthermore, the experiences conveyed by the interviewees tend to indicate that prejudice and discrimination are used as power resources to protect and enhance dominant group interests. When natives are requiring immigrants to adapt to the dominant culture in general or to use a specific language, the ultimate goal remains the same: to devalue and suppress everything

foreign, different. It is not enough for Latin Americans to become bilingual; they must assimilate completely to what is perceived as the US culture. Two basic elements are at work in the subordination process: (1) a dominant group must want to make another group believe that their national origin, ethnic background or language is inferior and (2) that the targeted group must become complicit in the process.

In addition, given that the proportion of Latin American immigrants is larger than the proportion of immigrants speaking any one language at any time in recent history, it is likely that there will be more instances for expression of the Spanish language and other cultural manifestations. As the literature on new destinations already cited and our own research suggests, the support structure existing in Indianapolis will most likely contribute to an increase in the number of immigrants coming to the city (Snodgrass, 2007). By virtue of their numbers, this group will gain more access to political power, which in turn will allow them to influence local policies that will respect the survival of their culture. But, this increasing foreign presence in most aspects of public life in Indianapolis may well, in turn, have negative consequences for the levels of prejudice and discrimination that immigrant groups would experience. Indeed, many Indiana natives may perceive their majority status to be in jeopardy and feel forced to adjust to ‘‘foreign cultures’’ in a manner never experienced before in this city (or in the state). A combination of economic competition and cultural issues (such as language or bilingual education) are likely to contribute to an increase in animosity between Indiana natives and Latin American immigrants in the future. Furthermore, as declarations and writings blaming Latin American immigrants for many faults of American society (real or imagined) will continue to be diffused through the popular media (including the internet), and the predisposition of a large part of the population to accept uncritically these views, immigrants in this city will be confronted with forms of prejudice and discrimination. As Chavez puts it, ‘‘the Latino Threat Narrative works so well and is so pervasive precisely because its basic premises are taken for granted as true’’ (2008, 41).

Thus, to the constraints and demands of different social situations we should add the economic, political, and social competition among groups in an increasingly multiethnic society such as Indianapolis. As the problems and tensions generated by the expanding international commerce, the globalization of the job market, and the economic crisis continue, Indiana natives are likely to increasingly associate the ills and disliked features of their changing city and state with the growing presence of Latin American immigrants (lower wages, job losses, and so on). Politicians are starting to take notice of this; two bills have recently been introduced in the Indiana legislative assembly: Senate Bill 335, to punish employers who hire undocumented immigrants, and House Bill 1383 to prevent undocumented immigrants from accessing health and other social services.

As Morganthau (1993) concluded at the beginning of the 1990s, the majority of the US population does not welcome recent immigrants, and our research demonstrates that in the first decade of the twenty-first century the situation has not changed much, at least in Indiana. Other research also reflects this tendency in the Midwest (Driever, 2004; Millard et al, 2004b; Alba et al, 2005). In sum, the research suggests that the process of integration will not be smooth and we

can expect difficulties for the immigrants for several years to come. Indeed, the present recession will not help to limit prejudice and discrimination against Latin American immigrants; rather the opposite. Even though there might be a slowdown in the number of immigrants arriving to Indiana and the United States in general, as some recent studies seem to indicate (Papademetriou and Terrazas, 2009), Latin American foreign-born immigrants, who have been traditionally employed in the sectors most affected by the present recession, such as construction, leisure and hospitality, personal services, and some areas of manufacturing, might end up moving into other areas of the economy accepting jobs for low pay and competing even more with other non-immigrant workers, and as a consequence, being subjected to increased rejection and discrimination on the part of the native population.

Perhaps, this ethnocentric response and the tendency of the native population to be relatively hostile to new immigrants could be attenuated if the political authorities started to provide more information, services, and create policies in favor of recent immigrants, as well as working with the local media to limit the broadcasting of negative stereotypes. As we saw, there is still very little institutional support in this town to receive and to respond to the needs of immigrants. The city of Indianapolis and suburbs have not adapted to integrate this new flow of immigrants and are still unprepared to deal with the increasing demands for social services and with social and cultural differences. It seems that politicians are more concerned with limiting immigration than to adapting to this new reality.

Acknowledgement

This research was supported, in part, by an International Awareness Grant from the Indiana Humanities Council and Butler University. We thank the *Latino Studies*' editorial board and the anonymous reviewers for their suggestions. They made a great difference in the final version of this article.

About the Authors

Antonio V. Menéndez-Alarcón is Professor of Sociology and Director of the International Studies Program at Butler University. He teaches courses on Latin America, Ethnic Relations, Globalization, Culture and Communication, and Social Movements. He received his PhD from the University of Notre Dame in 1991, and his BA and MA from the University of Paris, France. His primary areas of interest are International and comparative sociology, ethnic relations, and sociology of culture. He has published several books, and many articles in peer review journals in English, Spanish, and French. Some of his major publications include *Cultural Realm of European Integration* (Greenwood Press, 2004) and *Power and Television in Latin America*. (Praeger, 1992). He has recently co-edited the book *Safeguarding German–American Relations in the New Century: Understanding and Accepting Mutual Differences* (Lexington Publishers, 2006).

Katherine B. Novak is Professor and Chair of the Department of Sociology at Butler University. She received her MA and PhD from Indiana University. She teaches courses on research methods and statistics, social psychology, and mental illness and culture. Much of her research focuses on youth and adolescent substance use and abuse in different social contexts, and has published in a number of peer-reviewed journals including the *Journal of Family Issues*, *Journal of Drug Education*, *Addictive Behaviors*, *Child and Adolescent Substance Use* and the *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education*.

References

1. Aguirre, A. and D.V. Baker. 2000. *Structured Inequality in the United States: Critical Discussions and the Continuing Significance of Race, Ethnicity, and Gender*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
2. Alba, R.D. and G. Moore. 1982. Ethnicity in the American Elite. *American Sociological Review* 47: 373–382.
3. Alba, R.D., R.G. Rumbaut and K. Marotz. 2005. A Distorted Nation: Perceptions of Racial/Ethnic Group Sizes and Attitudes toward Immigrants and Other Minorities. *Social Forces* 84(2): 899–917.
4. Aponte, R. 2001. *Latinos in Indiana: Growth, Distribution, and Implications*. East Lansing, MI: Julian Samora Research Institute, Michigan State University.
5. Antonovsky, A. 1960. The Social Meaning of Discrimination. *Phylon* 21: 81–95.
6. Ball-Rokeach, S.J., M. Rokeach and J.W. Grube. 1984. *The Great American Values Test: Influencing Behavior and Belief through Television*. London: Collier Macmillan.
7. Beirich, H. 2008. Hate Groups in Indiana, http://www.splcenter.org/, accessed January 2009.
8. Benedict, A. and R.B. Kent. 2004. The Cultural Landscape of a Puerto Rican Neighborhood in Cleveland, Ohio. In *Hispanic Spaces, Latino Places: Community and Cultural Diversity in Contemporary America*, ed. D.D. Arreola, 187–206. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
9. Blumer, H. 1958. Race Prejudice as a Sense of Group Position. *Pacific Sociological Review* 1: 3–6.
10. Blumrosen, A.W. and R.G. Blumrosen. 2000. Intentional Job Discrimination in Metropolitan Areas: Indiana 1999, www.EEO1.com, accessed 1 February 2008.
11. Bourdieu, P. 1986. The Forms of Capital. In *Handbook for Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, ed. J.G. Richardson, 241–258. New York: Greenwood Press.
12. Bowsher, C.A. 1990. Immigration Reform: Employer Sanctions and the Question of Discrimination. March. http://www.dtic.mil/cgibin/GetTRDoc?AD=AD=ADA281094&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf, accessed 19 July 2007.
13. Broadway, M. 1994. Beef Stew: Cattle, Immigrants, and Established Residents in a Kansas Beefpacking Town. In *Newcomers in Workplace: Immigrants and the Restructuring of the US Economy*, eds. L. Lamphere, A. Stepick and G. Grenier, 25–43. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
14. Brown-Graham, A.R. 1999. Housing Discrimination against Hispanics in Private Rental Markets. *Popular Government* 65(1): 45–51.

15. Buchanan, P.J. 2002. *The Death of the West: How Dying Populations and Immigrants Invasions Imperil our Country and Civilization*. New York: St Martin's Press.
16. Carlin, M. 1999. Even Tougher on Farm labor? *Raleigh News and Observer*, 28 July.
17. Chavez, L.R. 2008. *The Latino Threat: Constructing Immigrants, Citizens, and the Nation*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
18. Clark, J. and J. Heet. 2007. Indiana Immigration and Workforce Patterns. *SIPR Publications*, 13 June.
19. Coleman, J.S. 1988. Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. *American Journal of Sociology* 94: 95–120.
20. Craighill, P.M. 2007. Poll Spanish Spoken Here, Two thirds don't mind, www.abcnews.go.com/US/story?id=3694870, accessed 14 November 2008.
21. Driever, S.L. 2004. Latinos in Polynuclear Kansas City. In *Hispanic Spaces, Latino Places: Community and Cultural Diversity in Contemporary America*, ed. D.D. Arreola, 207–224. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
22. Farley, J.E. 2000. *Majority-Minority Relations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
23. Feagin, J.R. and C.B. Feagin. 1978. *Discrimination American Style: Institutional Racism and Sexism*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
24. Felson, R.B. 1996. Mass Media Effects on Violent Behavior. *Annual Review of Sociology* 22: 103–129.
25. Frey, W.H. 2002. Census 2000 Reveals New Native-Born and Foreign-Born Shifts across US. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan. Population Studies Center Research Report, N^{o} 02-520.
26. Fore, E. 2006. Stereotyping, Prejudice, and Language Discrimination: Attitudes and Behaviors of Healthcare Professionals towards Limited-English-proficient Latinos. Paper presented at the APHA 134th Annual Meeting and Exposition; 4–8 November, Boston, MA. apha.confex.com/apha/134am/techprogram/paper/143556/htm, accessed 28 August 2008.
27. Gerbner, G., L. Gross, M.F. Eleey, M. Jackson-Beeck, S. Jeffries-Fox and N. Signorielli 1977. *Violence Profile no. 8: Trends in Network Television Drama and Viewer Conceptions of Social Reality, 1967–1976*. Philadelphia, PA: Annenberg School of Communications, University of Pennsylvania.
28. Gouveia, L., M.A. Carranza and J. Cogua. 2005. The Great Plains Migration: Mexicans and Latinos in Nebraska. In *New Destinations: Mexican Immigration in the United States*, eds. V. Zuñiga and R. Ferréndez-León, 23–49. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
29. Grey, M.A. and A.C. Woodrick. 2005. Latinos have Revitalized our Community: Mexican Migration and Anglo Response in Marshalltown, Iowa. In *New Destinations: Mexican Immigration in the United States*, eds. V. Zuñiga and R. Ferréndez-León, 50–69. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
30. Harding, G. 1990. Immigrants Harm the US Economy. In *Opposing Viewpoints: Illegal Immigration*, ed. W. Dudley. San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press.
31. Hopkins, R.N. 1990. Can the United States Assimilate the Wave of New Immigrants? *The Social Contract Journal* 1(2): 62–63.
32. Huntington, S.P. 2004a. *Who We Are: The Challenges to America's National Identity*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

33. Huntington, S.P. 2004b. The Hispanic Challenge. *Foreign Policy*, March-April 30–45.
34. IDWD-IBRC. 2006. In context. Indiana Department of Work Force Development/Indiana Business Research Center, Indianapolis. June. www.incontext.indiana.edu, accessed 20 May 2008.
35. IDWD-IBRC. 2007. In context. Indiana Department of Work Force Development/Indiana Business Research Center, Indianapolis. June. www.incontext.indiana.edu, accessed 21 May 2008.
36. Jaret, C. 1995. *Contemporary Racial and Ethnic Relations*. New York: Harper Collins.
37. Joge, T.C and S.M. Pérez. 2004. *The Mainstreaming of hate: A Report on Latinos Harassment, Hate, and Law Enforcement Abuse in the '90s*. Washington DC: National Council of La Raza.
38. Johnson-Webb, K.D. 2002. Employer Recruitment and Hispanic Labor Migration: North Carolina Urban Areas at the End of the Millennium. *The Professional Geographer* 54(3): 406–421.
39. Johnson-Webb, K.D. 2003. *Recruiting Hispanic Labor: Immigrants in Non-traditional Areas*. El Paso, TX: Lfb Scholarly Publishing.
40. Katz, J. 1996. Poultry industry Imports labor to do its Dirty Work. *Los Angeles Times* 8 December.
41. Lackland, S.D. 1992. Psychological Acculturation of Young Visible Immigrants. *Migration World Magazine* 20(3): 21–24.
42. Lamn, R.D. 1990. Testimony before the US House of Representatives Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on immigration, Refugees and International Law. 13 March.
43. Levinson, B.A.U., J. Everitt and L.C. Jones. 2007. Integrating Indiana's Latino Newcomers: A Study of State and Community Responses to the New Immigration. Center for Education and Society, Indiana University. Working Paper #1.
44. Lippi-Green, R. 1997. *English with an Accent. Language, Ideology, and Discrimination in the United States*. London: Routledge.
45. Marger, M.N. 2003. *Race and Ethnic Relations: American and Global Perspectives*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
46. Mason, P. 1970. *Patterns of Dominance*. New York: Oxford University Press.
47. Massey, D.S. 1999. Why Does Immigration Occur? In *The Handbook of International Migration: The American Experience*, eds. C. Hirschman, P. Kasinitz and J. DeWind, 34–52. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
48. Massey, D. and R. Zenteno. 1999. The Dynamics of Mass Migration. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 96(8): 5328–5335.
49. Mc Lemore, D.S., H.D. Romo and S. Gonzalez. 2000. *Racial and Ethnic Relations in America*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Allyn & Bacon.
50. M, S. and D. Alverio. 2001. The Portrayal of Latinos in Network Television News. National Association of Hispanic Journalists, Washington DC. http://www.nahj.org/pdf/brownout.pdf, accessed 12 February 2008.
51. Midwest Coalition to Reduce Immigration. 2008. The Issues, http://www.immigrationreform.org, accessed 23 May 2008.

52. Millard, A.V., J. Chapa and E. Diaz McConnell. 2004a. En Pocas Palabras [In a few Words]: Ten myths about Latinos. In *Apple Pie and Enchiladas: Latino Newcomers in the Rural Midwest*, eds. A.V. Millard and J. Chapa, 22–25. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
53. Millard, A.V., J. Chapa and E. Diaz McConnell. 2004b. Not Racist like our Parents: Anti-Latino Prejudice and Institutional Discrimination. In *Apple Pie and Enchiladas: Latino Newcomers in the Rural Midwest*, eds. A.V. Millard and J. Chapa, 102–124. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
54. Montalvo, D. 2006. The Network Brownout Report 2006: The Portrayal of Latinos and Latino Issues in Network Television News. National Association of Hispanic Journalists. Washington DC http://www.nahj.org/resources/2006Brownout.pdf, accessed 20 January 2008.
55. Morganthau, T. 1993. America: Still a Melting Pot? *Newsweek*, 9 August: 16–23.
56. Morrison, P. 1994. Commentary: Americans speak English – But we don't understand. Morning Edition, 23 May. National Public Radio. Transcript 940016680.
57. Navarrete, L. and C. Kamasaki. 1994. *Out of the Picture: Hispanics in the Media*. Washington DC: National Council of La Raza.
58. National Council of La Raza. 1986. *Beyond Ellis Island. Hispanics – Immigrants and Americans*. Washington DC: National Council of La Raza.
59. Oboler, S. 1995. *Ethnic Labels, Latino Lives: Identity and the Politics of (Re)presentation in the United States*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
60. Palmer, S. and W. Lutton. 1988. *The Immigration Time Bomb*. Monterey, VA: American Immigration Control Foundation.
61. Passel, J.S. 2006. The Size and Characteristics of the Unauthorized Migrant Population in the US Estimates Based on the March 2005 Current Population Survey. Washington DC: Pew Hispanic Center. http://pewhispanic.org/files/reports/61.pdf, accessed 24 May 2008.
62. Papademetriou, P. and A. Terrazas. 2009. *Immigrants and the Current Economic Crisis: Research Evidence, Policy Challenges, and Implications*. Washington DC: Migration Policy Institute.
63. Pinker, S. 1995. *The Language Instinct: How the Mind Creates Language*. New York: Harper Perennial.
64. Porter, J.D.R. 1971. *Black Child, White Child*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
65. Portes, A. and R.G. Rumbaut. 2000. *Immigrant America: A Portrait*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
66. Rich, B.L. and M. Miranda. 2005. The sociopolitical dynamics of Mexican immigration in Lexington, Kentucky, 1997 to 2002: An ambivalent community responds. In *New Destinations: Mexican Immigration in the United States*, eds. V. Zuñiga and R. Ferneández-León, 187–219. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
67. Rocco, R. 2004. Transforming Citizenship: Membership, Strategies of Containment, and the Public Sphere in Latino Communities. *Latino Studies* 2(1): 4–25.
68. Schlesinger Jr, A.M. 1992. *The Disuniting of America*. New York: W.W. Norton.
69. Singer, A. 2004. *The Rise of New Immigrant Gateways*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution.

70. Smith, A.W. 1981. Racial Tolerance as a Function of Group Position. *American Sociological Review* 46: 558–573.
71. Smith, R. and S. Mannon. 2006. Latina Immigrants in Non-Traditional Immigrant Destinations: The Case of Northern Utah. Paper presented at the American Sociological Association Annual Meeting; 11–14 August, Montreal, Canada.
72. Snodgrass, M. 2007. Bienvenidos a Talapolis. *Nuvo*, 5 December: 2.
73. Subervi, F. 2004. The Network Brownout Report 2004: The Portrayal of Latinos and Latino Issues in Network Television News. National Association of Hispanics Journalist. Washington DC. http://www.nahj.org/resources/2004Brownout.pdf, accessed 20 March 2006.
74. Suro, R. and A. Singer. 2002. *Latino Growth in Metropolitan America: Changing Patterns, New Locations*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution.
75. Stull, D.D., M.J. Boroadway and K.C. Erickson. 1992. The Price of a Good Steak: Beef Packing and its Consequences for Garden City, Kansas. In *Structuring Diversity: Ethnographic Perspectives on the New Immigration*, ed. L. Lamphere, 35–64. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
76. Taylor, M. and S. Stein. 1999. Network Helps Recruit Immigrants for US Job Market. *The Fort Worth Star-Telegram* 4 July.
77. UWCI-United Way of Central Indiana. 2000. The Indianapolis Hispanic Study. Indianapolis: United Way/Community Service Council. www.uwci.org, accessed 3 June 2003.
78. United States Department of Justice, Fair Housing. 2008. Recent Accomplishments of the Housing and Civil Enforcement Section, http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/housing/fairhousing/whatnew.htm, accessed 1 February 2008.
79. United States Department of Justice. 2008. Documents on Discrimination in Restaurants and other Public Places, http://www.usdoj.gov/, accessed 10 February 2008.
80. US Census Bureau. 2000. Foreign-Born Population by Citizenship and Selected Countries of Birth, http://www.census.gov/population/sociodemo/foreign, accessed 9 January 2004.
81. US Census Bureau. 2004. American Community Survey Population by Race and Latino origin in Indiana, http://www.census.gov/acs/, accessed 4 September 2007.
82. US Department of Housing and Urban Development. 2002. Discrimination in Metropolitan Housing Markets 1989–2000, http://www.hud.gov/news/release/cfm, accessed 22 December 2007.
83. Westie, F.P. 1964. Race and Ethnic Relations. In *Handbook of Modern Sociology*, ed. R.E.L. Faris, 576–618. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
84. Williams Jr, R.M. 1964. *Strangers Next Door: Ethnic Relations in American Communities*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
85. Wilson, W.J. 1973. *Power, Racism, and Privilege: Race Relations in Theoretical and Socio-Historical Perspective*. New York: Free Press.
86. Zuñiga, V and R. Ferneńdez-León, (eds.) 2005. *New Destinations: Mexican Immigration in the United States*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.